

Message

From: Adams, Glenn [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=C79E328CD4484265B012DFA81663F5E7-ADAMS, GLENN]
Sent: 3/16/2021 6:05:22 PM
To: Leff, Karin [Leff.Karin@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Oak Ridge - Intent of Administrator's decision regarding Point-of-exposure vs Point-of-compliance

Thanks

From: Leff, Karin <Leff.Karin@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2021 2:04 PM
To: Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>; Adams, Glenn <Adams.Glenn@epa.gov>; Dixon, Chelsea <Dixon.Chelsea@epa.gov>; Gervais, Gregory <Gervais.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dalzell, Sally <Dalzell.Sally@epa.gov>; Richards, Jon M. <Richards.Jon@epa.gov>; Froede, Carl <Froede.Carl@epa.gov>; Alexander, Shanna <Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov>; Frederick, Tim <Frederick.Tim@epa.gov>
Cc: Lapachin, Jyl <Lapachin.Jyl@epa.gov>; Cooke, Maryt <Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov>; Lukens, Elizabeth <Lukens.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Baier-Anderson, Caroline <Baier-Anderson.Caroline@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Oak Ridge - Intent of Administrator's decision regarding Point-of-exposure vs Point-of-compliance

I'll be a few minutes late.

Karin Leff (she/her)
Director, Federal Facilities Enforcement Office
MC 2261A
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington DC 20460
202 564-7068 (Office)
202 236-3669 (Cell)

NOTICE: ENFORCEMENT CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED: DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA: This message is being sent by or on behalf of an attorney. It is intended exclusively for the individual(s) or entity(s) to whom or to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the named addressee, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy, or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and delete all copies of the message.

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2021 9:59 AM
To: Amoroso, Cathy; Adams, Glenn; Dixon, Chelsea; Leff, Karin; Gervais, Gregory; Dalzell, Sally; Richards, Jon M.; Froede, Carl; Alexander, Shanna; Frederick, Tim
Cc: Lapachin, Jyl; Cooke, Maryt; Lukens, Elizabeth; Baier-Anderson, Caroline
Subject: Oak Ridge - Intent of Administrator's decision regarding Point-of-exposure vs Point-of-compliance
When: Tuesday, March 16, 2021 2:00 PM-3:00 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

UPDATE:

EPA/DOE/TDEC are working at a project team level to develop PRGs and effluent levels for radiological discharges into Bear Creek – trying, as best they can, to adhere to the Administrator’s decision. The team is looking for a better understanding of the intent of the decision with regards to extrapolating from instream level at the point of exposure to an effluent number at the point of compliance, and whether a dilution factor can be applied.

Regarding developing PRGs and effluent levels for radionuclides, the DOE team envisions:

1. Select a stretch of Bear Creek that could reasonably be fished (recreation). The three parties (DOE, EPA and TDEC) would agree on the location. Call it “the place of reasonable maximum exposure.”
2. Conduct fish survey/population study at the place of reasonable maximum exposure. From that data, develop agreed upon consumption rates/frequency.
3. Using PRG calculator, develop PRGs for each radionuclide, using the site-specific consumption inputs (in step #2, above) rather than default consumption inputs.
4. Using the resulting PRGs, apply a dilution factor to account for the flow rate of the place of reasonable maximum exposure back to the discharge point (where effluent enters creek). There is a big difference in flow rate from the place where fishing may occur to the v-weir.

R4 is in general agreement with steps 1-3, but not with step 4 (application of dilution factor). It is our understanding that the decision instructs us to develop a PRG for fish consumption, and that this number is applied to the point of compliance (effluent enters sw), with no dilution factor. Assimilative capacity of the receiving water body can be used at the point the pipe enters the water. Further, assimilative capacity should be based on critical flow conditions (30Q5).

- a) The “relief” given by the decision is that, rather than using CWA default parameters for fish consumption, site specific consumption rates can be used. These site specific consumption rates are determined based on a place in Bear Creek that can be reasonably expected to support recreational fishing. The resulting PRGs would be applied at the point of compliance (and throughout the stream – an “instream” number).
- b) The assimilative capacity, if any, of the receiving body can be used to extrapolate the instream PRG to the effluent to develop the effluent concentration (we do not know where the EMDF wastewater will be discharged, but likely a small tributary of Bear Creek).

R4 interpretation is very different than DOE’s, and we would like some insight from those involved with drafting the decision 😊

Other issues:

DOE is proposing that the ROD be finalized without effluent limits for radionuclides, followed by a post ROD modification to add the limits.

DOE is proposing to revise the FFS concurrently with the ROD, but not prior to the ROD.

DOE interprets the decision as not requiring additional public comment, nor revised PP.

Would like input on those items, too.

Thank you!

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 202-991-0477,617293136#](#) United States, Washington DC

Phone Conference ID: 617 293 136#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

By participating in EPA hosted virtual meetings and events, you are consenting to abide by the agency's terms of use. In addition, you acknowledge that content you post may be collected and used in support of FOIA and eDiscovery activities.

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)
